IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re:)))
Application of Storag Etzel GmbH for an Order, Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1782, to Obtain Discovery for Use in a Foreign Proceeding	Case No.: 19-mc-00209-CFC Redacted Document Filed January 16, 2020 Redacted Document Filed January 16, 2020
÷	Sealed Document Filed January 9, 2020 (DI 34)))

SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF THE APPLICATION

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I, declare:

1. I am a partner of the international law firm Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP ("Freshfields"). I am an attorney qualified in Germany (Rechtsanwalt), and I am admitted to the Bar in Frankfurt am Main in good standing. I also hold a Master of Laws Degree from the University of Miami.

2.

3. I submit this Supplemental Declaration in support of Storag's Reply Brief in Further Support of Its Application pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1782 ("Section 1782") for discovery from Baker Hughes, a GE Company, LLC (the "Application").

There Are No Rules Or Decisions That Prohibit Or Limit The Discovery Storag Seeks From Baker Hughes

4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
	Baker Hughes Misstates The Relevance Of Storag's Discovery Requests
8.	

10	
10.	
11.	
12.	
	Storag believes that Baker Hughes is in possession of documents –

Baker Hughes Misstates The Relevance Of The Between Other Parties To Storag's Application

13. I am not aware of any statement or court ruling in the	¹ that
would affect Storag's need for the discovery requested for the	Storag is not a
party in the	
Discovery From Baker Hughes Is Needed For	
Storag's Upcoming Briefs	
14.	
15.	
13.	
	The discovery
sought by Storag in its Application is relevant for its brief as the discovery	
Storag expects that discovery will	
	11.11
Storag is not a party to the	his proceeding.

that show that key evidence was withheld from
16. Furthermore, Storag has not submitted its reply brief for which
it will depend on the documents its Application seeks from Baker Hughes.
17. Accordingly, Baker Hughes' attempt to delay discovery by seeking to stay the
1782 proceeding risks irrevocable prejudice to Storag because delaying discovery would prevent Storag from being able to fully argue its case (making use of documents held by Baker Hughes)
in both its Storag cannot access the highly relevant documents held by Baker Hughes in the US without this Court's assistance as the
Tribunal does not have subpoena power over Baker Hughes as a non-party to
I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the
foregoing is true and correct. Executed January 9, 2020, in Frankfulla Mail. Germany
By:

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Rebecca L. Butcher, Esquire hereby certify that on January 9, 2020, a true and correct copy of the foregoing *Supplemental Declaration in Support of the Application* was caused to be electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF, which will send notification of such filing to the following counsel of record:

Anne Shea Gaza (No. 4093)
Robert M. Vrana (No. 5666)
Samantha G. Wilson (No. 5816)
YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP
Rodney Square
1000 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 571-6600
agaza@ycst.com
rvrana@ycst.com
swilson@ycst.com

Attorneys for Respondent Baker Hughes, a GE Company, LLC

I further certify that on January 9, 2020, I caused the foregoing document to be served via electronic mail upon the above-listed counsel.

Dated: January 9, 2020 LANDIS RATH & COBB LLP

<u>|s| Rebecca L. Butcher</u>

Rebecca L. Butcher (No. 3816) Matthew R. Pierce (No. 5946) 919 Market Street, Suite 1800 Wilmington, DE 19801

Telephone: (302) 467-4400 Facsimile: (302) 467-4450 Email: butcher@lrclaw.com pierce@lrclaw.com

Attorneys for Applicant Storag Etzel GmbH